arXiv:1206.5581v2 [math.LO] 30 Sep 2012

On partitions of Ellentuck-large sets

Ryszard Frankiewicz Sławomir Szczepaniak

Abstract

It is proved that no non-meager set in the space $[\omega]^\omega$ equipped with the Ellentuck topology does admit the Kuratowski's partition, e.i. it cannot be covered by a family $\mathfrak{F}$ of disjoint meager sets with the property that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}'$ has the Baire property for every subfamily $\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$.

1. Introduction.

We consider the set $[\omega]^\omega$ of infinite subsets of ω (natural numbers) equipped with the topology in which sets of form $[a, A] = \{B \in [A]^\omega : a \sqsubset B \subseteq a \cup A\}$, where $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$ and $A \in [\omega]^\omega$, establish a base of this topology (the expression '$a \sqsubset B$' means that 'a is a initial segment of B'). This space, denoted by $[\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$, is quite well studied. For example, it is widely known that $[\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$ is neither compact nor metrizable (it is even non-normal, see [5]) but a Baire space; moreover, its nowhere dense sets form a σ-ideal [6]. Nowhere dense set $X \subseteq [\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$ can be characterized in a combinatorial manner by the condition

for every set of form $[a, A]$ *there exists* $B \in [A]^\omega$ *such that* $[a, B] \cap X = \emptyset$

and called Ramsey null (RN) set. It is a special case of so called completely Ramsey (CR) set; a set $X \subseteq [\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$ is a CR set if the following is satisfied

$$\textit{for every set of form } [a, A] \textit{ there exists } B \in [A]^\omega \textit{ such that } \begin{array}{c} \textit{either } [a, B] \subseteq X \\ \textit{or } [a, B] \cap X = \emptyset \end{array}$$

It turns out that CR sets in $[\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$ are exactly the sets having the Baire property (having BP in short), e.i. they are of the form $O \triangle M$ with O open and M meager (see [6]). The above nice combinatorial characterizations are reasons why $[\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$ resembles nonseparable metric spaces. For example, cardinal characteristics (weight, density, Baire number, etc.) of $[\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$ are not too large (usually not greater that continuum). Furthermore many techniques for metric spaces work also for the space $[\omega]^\omega_{\text{EL}}$, e.g. one can easily proved by copying of idea of the standard construction of Bernstein set in Polish spaces that any family of disjoint *RN* sets covering whole $[\omega]^\omega_{\mathrm{EL}}$ contains a subfamily which its sum is not a *CR* set. The previous holds since such family need to be of cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$. However it may be no longer true for some particular non-meager set; less than $\mathfrak{c}$ RN sets can cover it. Thus it has appeared some time ago the hypothesis that some non-meager subset of $[\omega]^\omega_{\mathrm{EL}}$ has a covering $\mathfrak{F}$ of disjoint relative meager (i.e. *RN*) sets with this special property that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}'$ has the relative Baire property (i.e. *CR*) for every subfamily $\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$. Such a family $\mathfrak{F}$ we shall call *Kuratowski's partition* of this non-meager set. The main motivation to investigate Kuratowski's partitions is the following equivalence

> *no subspace of the form $G \setminus F \subseteq X$, where G is open and*
> *F meager set, does admit a Kuratowski's partition*
> *if and only if*
> *for each Baire-measurable function $f : X \mapsto Y$, where Y is second*
> *countable, there exists a meager set $F \subset X$ such that $f_{\restriction X \setminus F}$ is continuous.*

It has been hoped that a proof of the existence of a Kuratowski's partition for some non-meager set in $[\omega]^\omega_{\mathrm{EL}}$ should be similar to the one given in [3] where the equiconsistency of the following statements was proved

(1) ZFC + *"there exists measurable cardinal"*
(2) ZFC + *"there exists a complete metric space X with*
the Kuratowski's partition"
(3) ZFC + *"there exists a Baire metric space X with*
the Kuratowski's partition"

The space X was constructed using a precipitous ideal on ω_1 and define as a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c})$, the space of sequences of length ω with values in a set $\mathfrak{c} = \{\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$, equipped with the standard Tikhonov topology while $\mathfrak{c}$ possessing discrete topology (it was also known that whole $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{c})$ does not admit Kuratowski's partition).

The purpose of the paper is to show that the above hopes were vain and the hypothesis was false. We present the proof (in *ZFC* only) of the fact that no non-meager set in the space $[\omega]^\omega_{\mathrm{EL}}$ does admit the Kuratowski's partition. This will be done in Section **2**. In Section **3** it shown that the existence of Kuratowski's partition in some Baire space implies the existence of Kuratowski's partition in some Baire metric space. The presented construction of the last space is closely related to the one that appeared in [3] an mentioned above.

2. The Ellentuck topology and a Kuratowski's partition.

All topological notions in this section always refer to the Ellentuck topology $[\omega]^{\omega}_{\mathrm{EL}}$ or topologies induced by the last one. To be careful let $K(X)$ denotes a family of meager sets in a space X and $K^{+}(X)$ stands for a set of non-meager sets in X. The following small letters a, b, c refer to the elements of $[\omega]^{<\omega}$ and big ones A, B, C to the elements of $[\omega]^{\omega}$. Besides just mentioned partial orderings '$\subseteq$' and '$\sqsubseteq$' it is used also the following ordering in $\mathcal{P}(X)$

$$X_0 \subseteq_{\star} X_1 \Leftrightarrow X_0 \setminus X_1 \in K(X) \text{ for } X_0, X_1 \subseteq X.$$

For the subspace X of $[\omega]^{\omega}_{\mathrm{EL}}$ denote its basis (in relative Ellentuck topology) by $\mathcal{B}(X) = \{[a, A]_X : a \in [\omega]^{<\omega},\ A \in [\omega]^{\omega}\}$, where $[a, A]_X = [a, A] \cap X$ and define also $\mathcal{B}[\mathfrak{F}'] = \{[b, B]_X \in \mathcal{B}(X) : [b, B]_X \subseteq_{\star} \bigcup \mathfrak{F}'\}$ for $\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$. Note finally a validity of

Lemma 1 $[a, A] \cap [b, B] = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow a \perp b$ *or* $|A \cap B| < \omega$.

The main theorem of the paper is

Theorem 1 *No non-meager set in* $[\omega]^{\omega}_{\mathrm{EL}}$ *does admit a Kuratowski's partition.*

Proof

Take a set $X \in K^{+}([\omega]^{\omega}_{\mathrm{EL}})$ and a disjoint family $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq K(X)$ such that $X = \bigcup \mathfrak{F}$. Hence there exists $[a, A]$ such that for any $B \subseteq A$ it holds $[a, B] \cap X = [a, B]_X \neq \emptyset$. Begin the proof of **Theorem 1** with the following

Lemma 2 *If* $\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ *is such that* $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \in K^{+}(X)$*, then there exists* $\mathfrak{F}'' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}'$ *such that both sets* $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}''$ *and* $\bigcup(\mathfrak{F}' \setminus \mathfrak{F}'')$ *are in* $K^{+}(X)$.

Proof of Lemma 2

Of course, it is sufficient to prove it only for $\mathfrak{F}$. Moreover, it can be assumed that $[a, A]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathfrak{F}$. Suppose now that the thesis of lemma is false, e.i. for all decomposition of $\mathfrak{F}$ into $\mathfrak{F}^0$ and $\mathfrak{F}^1$ there exists $i < 2$ such that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}^i \in K(X)$. Put $\mathfrak{F}_0 = \mathfrak{F}$, $b_0 = a$ and $B_0 = A$ and let sets $\mathfrak{F}_i, b_i, B_i$ for $i < n$ be defined with the following properties

(*i*) $\mathfrak{F}_0 \supseteq \mathfrak{F}_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and $\bigcup(\mathfrak{F} \setminus \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}) \in K(X)$;

(*ii*) $b_0 \sqsubset b_1 \sqsubset \cdots \sqsubset b_{n-1} \sqsubset B_{n-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq B_1 \subseteq B_0$ and for any $i < n$

$[b_i, B_i]_X \subseteq_{\star} \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i$ and $[b_i, B_i]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathfrak{F}_i$.

By induction define now for $i < \omega$ the following elements of $[\omega]^{<\omega}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{F})$

$$b_n^0 = b_{n-1} \cup \{\min(B_{n-1}/b_{n-1})\},\ \mathfrak{F}_n^0 = \{F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1} : [b_n^0, B_{n-1}]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset\},$$

$$b_n^i = b_{n-1} \cup \{\min(B_{n-1}/b_n^{i-1})\},\ \mathfrak{F}_n^i = \{F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1} \setminus \bigcup_{j<i} \mathfrak{F}_n^j : [b_n^i, B_{n-1}]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset\},$$

where $B/b = \{m \in B : \max(b) < m\}$. Since $\{\mathfrak{F}_n^i\}_{i<\omega}$ is a partition of $\mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ then the assumption on a form decomposition of $\mathfrak{F}$ implies that there exists $k(n) < \omega$ such that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}_n^{k(n)} \in K^+(X)$ while $\bigcup(\mathfrak{F}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{F}_n^{k(n)})$ and hence $\bigcup(\mathfrak{F} \setminus \mathfrak{F}_n^{k(n)})$ are in $K(X)$. Put $b_n = b_n^{k(n)}$ and choose $B_n \subseteq B_{n-1}$ such that $[b_n, B_n]_X \cap \bigcup(\mathfrak{F}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{F}_n^{k(n)}) = \emptyset$. Put $\mathfrak{F}_n = \{F \in \mathfrak{F}_n^{k(n)} : [b_n, B_n]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$. Then it is easy to see that the following conditions are satisfied for all $n < \omega$

$$\text{(2.1)} \quad \mathfrak{F}_0 \supseteq \mathfrak{F}_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathfrak{F}_n \supseteq \ldots \text{ and } \bigcup(\mathfrak{F} \setminus \mathfrak{F}_n) \in K(X);$$

$$\text{(2.2)} \quad b_0 \sqsubset b_1 \sqsubset \cdots \sqsubset b_n \sqsubset \cdots \subseteq B_n \subseteq \cdots \subseteq B_1 \subseteq B_0,$$

$$[b_n, B_n]_X \subseteq_\star \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_n \text{ and } [b_n, B_n]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } F \in \mathfrak{F}_n.$$

Denote $\mathfrak{F}' = \bigcap_{n<\omega} \mathfrak{F}_n$. Then (2.1) implies that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \in K^+(X)$. On the other hand (2.2) implies that

$$\left\{\bigcup_{n<\omega} b_n\right\} \cap F = \bigcap_{n<\omega} [b_n, B_n]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } F \in \mathfrak{F}'.$$

Since $\mathfrak{F}'$ is a disjoint family the above follows that $\mathfrak{F}'$ is one-element family and hence $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \in K(X)$(a unique one that contains of $\bigcup_{n<\omega} b_n$), a contradiction. Therefore $\mathfrak{F}$ is not a Kuratowski's partition. $\square$

Suppose now that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a Kuratowski's partition, e.i $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}'$ has BP (equivalently, is a CR set) in X for all $\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$. Denote $\mathfrak{F}_\emptyset = \mathfrak{F}$, $[a_\emptyset, A_\emptyset]_X = [a, A]_X$ and from **Lemma 2** and assumption that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}_0', \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_1'$ have BP it follows that there exist $[a_i, A_i]_X \subseteq_\star \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i'$ for $i < 2$. Next, from **Lemma 1** chosen a_i's are incomparable (w.r.t. $\sqsubseteq$) or A_i's are almost disjoint; the second case will be preferable, that is, if it is a possibility that the sets $[a_i, A_i]_X$ can be chosen with almost disjoint A_i's, then it is done. Put now $\mathfrak{F}_i = \{F \in \mathfrak{F}_i' : [a_i, A_i]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$ for $i < 2$. This process can be continued, that is, using the algorithm

$(A1)$ for already constructed $F_s \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ use **Lemma 2** to get disjoint $\mathfrak{F}'_{s\hat{}0}, \mathfrak{F}'_{s\hat{}1} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_s$ such that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}'_{s\hat{}i} \in K^+(X)$ for $i < 2$,

$(A2)$ choose $[a_{s\hat{}i}, A_{s\hat{}i}]_X \subseteq_\star \mathfrak{F}'_{s\hat{}i}$ for $i < 2$ such that $A_{s\hat{}0} \cap A_{s\hat{}1}$ is finite; if such a choice is impossible then

$(A2')$ choose any sets $[a_{s\hat{}i}, A_{s\hat{}i}]_X \subseteq_\star \mathfrak{F}'_{s\hat{}i}$ for $i < 2$,

$(A3)$ put $\mathfrak{F}_{s\hat{}i} = \{F \in \mathfrak{F}'_{s\hat{}i} : [a_{s\hat{}i}, A_{s\hat{}i}]_X \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$ for $i < 2$.

it is obtained the Cantor scheme $\{\mathfrak{F}_s \subseteq \mathfrak{F} : s \in \{0,1\}^{<\omega}\}$ having the following properties:

$$(i)\ \mathfrak{F}_{s\hat{}0} \cup \mathfrak{F}_{s\hat{}1} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_s, \qquad (ii)\ \mathfrak{F}_{s\hat{}0} \cap \mathfrak{F}_{s\hat{}1} = \emptyset, \qquad (iii)\ [a_s, A_s]_X \subseteq_\star \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_s$$

From the above conditions one can conclude that for all $n < \omega$ the families

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{B}_n = \{[a_s, A_s]_X \in \mathcal{B}(X) : s \in \{0,1\}^n\}$$

consist of disjoint sets and $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ $\star$refines $\mathcal{B}_n$ that is

$$(2.4) \quad [a_{s\hat{}i}, A_{s\hat{}i}]_X \subseteq_\star [a_s, A_s]_X \quad \text{for all } s \in \{0,1\}^{<\omega} \text{ and } i < 2.$$

Lemma 1 and $(A2)$ force to consider the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{n < \omega : \exists_{s,t \in \{0,1\}^n} |A_s \cap A_t| < \omega\}.$$

Then two cases can occur: either (a) $|\mathcal{M}| = \omega$ or (b) $|\mathcal{M}| < \omega$.

If (a) holds then from (2.4) it is immediately seen that the set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{0,1\}^\omega$, maximal respect to the property

$$\forall_{f,g \in \mathcal{S}} \ (f \neq g \Rightarrow \exists_{n<\omega} |A_{f\restriction n} \cap A_{g\restriction n}| < \omega\}),$$

is of cardinality continuum. In a result the following sets

$$\left\{ \bigcap_{n<\omega} [a_{f\restriction n}, A_{f\restriction n}]_X : \ f \in \mathcal{S} \right\} \text{ and } \left\{ \bigcap_{n<\omega} \mathfrak{F}_{f\restriction n} : \ f \in \mathcal{S} \right\}$$

are injective families with continuum many nonempty elements. Hence the family $\mathfrak{F}$ is of maximal cardinality, e.i. $|\mathfrak{F}| = \mathfrak{c}$.

If (b) holds then for any $s \in \{0,1\}^{\max(\mathcal{M})+1}$ it holds $A_t = A_s$ for all $t \sqsupseteq s$. Furthermore, because of $(A2)$, the sets $\mathcal{B}[\mathfrak{F}_s]$ are countable and since $|\{0,1\}^{\max(\mathcal{M})+1}| < \omega$ also $\mathcal{B}[\mathfrak{F}]$ is countable. Therefore the following dichotomy is obtained

(a) either $\mathfrak{F}$ is of cardinality of continuum

(b) or the set $\mathcal{B}[\mathfrak{F}]$ is countable

Case (a)
Enumerate $\mathcal{B}^+(X) = \mathcal{B}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$. The objective is to construct disjoint subfamilies $\mathfrak{F}_0, \mathfrak{F}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ such that

$$\forall_{i<2} \forall_{\alpha<\mathfrak{c}} \; U_\alpha \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.5}$$

At a stage $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ partial subfamilies $\mathfrak{F}_i(\alpha) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ (for $i < 2$) are constructed with less than continuum many elements and such that $\mathfrak{F}_0(\alpha) \cap \mathfrak{F}_1(\alpha) = \emptyset$ for all $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$ and such that the following holds

$$\forall_{i<2} \forall_{\beta<\alpha} \; U_\beta \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta) \neq \emptyset. \tag{2.6}$$

So suppose that just such partial families as above are already built. Consider an element $U_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$. Define $\mathfrak{F}_i(\alpha)$ for $i < 2$ as follows

> if for any $i < 2$ there exists $\beta_i < \alpha$ such that $U_\alpha \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta_i) \neq \emptyset$,
> then put $\mathfrak{F}_i(\alpha) = \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta_i)$ for both $i < 2$;
>
> if there exits $i < 2$ such that $U_\alpha \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta) = \emptyset$ for all $\beta < \alpha$,
> while $U_\alpha \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_{1-i}(\beta_{1-i}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\beta_{1-i} < \alpha$,
> then put $\mathfrak{F}_{1-i}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{F}_{1-i}(\beta_{1-i})$ and $F_i(\alpha) = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta) \cup \{F_i^\alpha\}$,
> where $F_i^\alpha \in \mathfrak{F}$ is an arbitrary set such that $F_i^\alpha \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$;
>
> if for any $i < 2$ and for all $\beta < \alpha$ it holds $U_\alpha \cap \bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta) = \emptyset$,
> then put $\mathfrak{F}_i(\alpha) = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathfrak{F}_i(\beta) \cup \{F_i^\alpha\}$ for both $i < 2$,
> where $F_0^\alpha, F_1^\alpha \in \mathfrak{F}$ are different meager sets such that $F_i^\alpha \cap U_\alpha \neq \emptyset$
> (there exist two different sets as above; otherwise, non-meager U_α
> could be covered by some meager set).

Finally, define

$$\mathfrak{F}_i = \bigcup_{\alpha<\mathfrak{c}} \mathfrak{F}_i(\alpha) \text{ for } i < 2$$

and it is obvious that (2.5) is satisfied. However it means that the sets $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}_i$ for $i < 2$ are disjoint and dense in X, e.i. they are not CR sets. This is a contradiction with the assumption that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a Kuratowski's partition.

Case (b)

Enumerate $\mathcal{B}[\mathfrak{F}] = \{U_n \in \mathcal{B}(X) : n < \omega\}$ and $\mathfrak{F} = \{F_\alpha \in \mathfrak{F} : \alpha < |\mathfrak{F}|\}$. Since $\mathcal{B}[\mathfrak{F}]$ is nonempty, a set $\bigcup \mathfrak{F} \in K^+(X)$; so let

$$\lambda = \min\left\{\beta < |\mathfrak{F}| : \bigcup_{\alpha<\beta} F_\alpha \in K^+(X)\right\}.$$

Note that the following sets

$$E^0_n = \bigcup\{F_\beta \in \mathfrak{F} : \sup\{\alpha : F_\alpha \cap U_n \neq \emptyset\} < \beta < \lambda\}$$

$$E^1_m = \bigcup\{F_\beta \in \mathfrak{F} : \beta < \min\{\alpha : F_\alpha \cap U_m \neq \emptyset\} < \lambda\}$$

are in $K(X)$ for all $n, m < \omega$. For suppose that for some $n < \omega$ the set $E^0_n \in K^+(X)$. Therefore there exists $m < \omega$ such that $U_m \subseteq_\star E^0_n$. Put $\gamma = \min\{\alpha : F_\alpha \cap U_m \neq \emptyset\}$. Then by the definition of E^0_n it is satisfied that $U_n \subseteq_\star \bigcup_{\alpha<\gamma} F_\alpha$ and thus the last set is non-meager but it is impossible since $\gamma < \lambda$. A meagerness of sets of form E^1_m can be shown similarly. Therefore a set

$$E = \bigcup_{n<\omega} E^0_n \cup \bigcup_{m<\omega} E^1_m$$

is in $K(X)$. Denote $G = \bigcup_{n<\omega} U_n$ and note that an identity $G =_\star \bigcup \mathfrak{F}'$ implies a meagerness (in X) of the following set

$$\bigcup\Big\{F_\beta \in \mathfrak{F}' : \beta \leqslant \min\{\alpha < \lambda : F_\alpha \cap G \neq \emptyset\} \vee \sup\{\alpha < \lambda : F_\alpha \cap G \neq \emptyset\} \leqslant \beta\Big\}.$$

Denote it by E'. Then it is easily seen that $E \cup E' = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} F_\alpha$. However it means that the last set is meager that contradicts to the choice of λ.

In a result, both cases cannot happen. This proves that $\mathfrak{F}$ is not a Kuratowski's partition for $X \in K^+([\omega]^\omega_{\mathrm{EL}})$. $\square$

Remark. As mentioned in **Introduction** from **Theorem 1** it follows

Corollary 1 *For each Baire-measurable function* $f : [\omega]^\omega_{EL} \mapsto Y$*, where* Y *is second countable, there exists a RN set* $F \subset [\omega]^\omega_{EL}$ *such that* $f_{\upharpoonright [\omega]^\omega_{EL} \setminus F}$ *is continuous.*

3. Construction of a Baire metric space.

Denote $\tau^+ = \tau \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ for topology τ on a set X and consider $X(\tau)$ defined as follows

$$X(\tau) = \left\{ x \in^\omega (\tau^+) : \bigcap_{n<\omega} x(n) \neq \emptyset, \forall_{n<\omega} \bigcap_{k<n} x(k) \in K^+(X) \right\}$$

and treated as a subset of a complete metric space ${}^\omega(\tau^+)$, where the set τ^+ is equipped with the discrete topology. This space is very closely related to the space $X(I)$ defined in [3] and both space have almost the same properties as shows below theorems as well as theirs proofs. A basis of the space $X(\tau)$ is given by the sets of the form $[s]_{X(\tau)} = [s] \cap X(\tau)$ for $s \in^{<\omega} \tau^+$, where $[s] = \{x \in^\omega (\tau^+) : \exists_{n<\omega} x_{\restriction n} = s\}$ is a canonical basis set of ${}^\omega(\tau^+)$.

Theorem 2 *If (X, τ) is a Baire space that does admit a Kuratowski's partition, then $X(\tau)$ as a subspace of $(\tau^+)^\omega$ is also a Baire but metric space admitting a Kuratowski's partition.*

Proof

First note that since (X, τ) is a Baire space then the space $X(\tau)$ is simply the following set $\{x \in^\omega (\tau^+) : \bigcap_{n<\omega} x(n) \neq \emptyset\}$. Suppose now that $X(\tau)$ is not a Baire space. Then there exist dense open sets $U_n \subseteq X(\tau)$, $n < \omega$, such that $\bigcap_{n<\omega} U_n = \emptyset$. Define for $n > 0$ the following families

$$\mathcal{V}_n = \left\{ [s]_{X(\tau)} \subseteq U_{n-1} : s \in^n (\tau^+) \right\} \text{ and put } \mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V}_1.$$

Then for $n < \omega$ a set $\bigcup \mathcal{V}_n$ is dense open and it is subset of $U_{\max\{0,n-1\}}$. Now, it is easy to see that sets defined below

$$W_n = \bigcup \left\{ \bigcap_{k \in dom(s)} s(k) \in \tau^+ : [s]_{X(\tau)} \in \bigcup \mathcal{V}_n \right\}$$

are dense open sets such that $\bigcap_{n<\omega} W_n = \emptyset$ since $\bigcap_{n<\omega} (\bigcup \mathcal{V}_n) = \emptyset$. It is a contradiction with the assumption that (X, τ) is a Baire space.

To prove the second assertion let $\kappa = |X|$ and fix a bijection $\varphi : X \mapsto \kappa$. Next, fix a Kuratowski's partition $\mathfrak{F}$ for X and define for any $F \in K(X)$ the following subsets of $X(\tau)$

$$K_F = \left\{ x \in X(\tau) : \min \left(\varphi'' \bigcap_{n<\omega} x(n) \right) \in \varphi'' F \right\}.$$

A verification that $K_F \in K(X(\tau))$ for all $F \in K(X)$ is straightforward; indeed, for any $s \in^{<\omega} (\tau^+)$ define $t \in^{dom(s)+1} (\tau^+)$ as $t_{\restriction dom(s)} = s$ and where $t(dom(s)) \in \tau^+$ is a subset of $\bigcap_{k<dom(s)} s(k) \in \tau^+$ disjoint from F; hence $[t]_{X(\tau)} \cap K_F = \emptyset$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that $\{K_F\}_{F \in \mathfrak{F}}$ is a partition of $X(\tau)$. Therefore one needs only to show that for any $\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ such that $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \in K^+(X)$ a set

$$P = \bigcup_{F \in \mathfrak{F}} K_F$$

has BP in $X(\tau)$. Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a Kuratowski's partition of X there exists $G \in \tau^+$ such that $G \triangle \bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \in K(X)$. Having this put $\mathcal{G} = \{U \in \tau^+ : U \subseteq G\}$ and

$$V = \bigcup_{n<\omega} \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{G}} \{x \in X(\tau) : x(n) = U\}$$

open in $X(\tau)$. First of all note that $V \setminus P \in K(X(\tau))$ since $V \setminus P \subseteq K_{G \setminus \bigcup \mathfrak{F}'}$ and $G \setminus \bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \in K(X)$. Next put $E = P \setminus V$ and suppose that $E \in K^+(X(\tau))$. Therefore a set $E \cap [s]_{X(\tau)}$ is dense in $[s]_{X(\tau)}$ for some $s \in^{<\omega} (\tau^+)$ (i.e. extensions of s are in E); in particular $E \cap [s]_{X(\tau)} \in K^+(X(\tau))$. Denoting $C = \bigcap_{k<dom(s)} s(k) \in \tau^+$ one can notice that $E \cap V = \emptyset$ implies that $C \cap G = \emptyset$; otherwise it would exist in E an extension x of s defined as $x(k) = C \cap G$ for $k \geqslant dom(s)$. However $C \subseteq X \setminus G$ means that $E \cap [s]_{X(\tau)} \subseteq K_{\bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \setminus G}$ and hence $E \cap [s]_{X(\tau)} \in K(X(\tau))$ since $\bigcup \mathfrak{F}' \setminus G \in K(X)$. The contradiction shows that $E \in K(X(\tau))$ as well as $P \triangle V$, i.e. P has BP in $X(\tau)$ and finally the family $\{K_F\}_{F \in \mathfrak{F}}$ forms a Kuratowski's partition of in $X(\tau)$. $\square$

Theorem 2 and **Theorem 3** mean that the issue of the existence of Kuratowski's partition is not a metric problem. If some Baire space admits such a partition then one can easily construct a Baire metric space with Kuratowski's partition. This result combined with the main theorem from [3] that was mentioned in **Introduction** yields the following

Corollary 2 *The following theories are equiconsistent:*
(1) ZFC + "there exists measurable cardinal"
(2) ZFC + "there exists a Baire metric space X with
the Kuratowski's partition"
(3) ZFC + "there exists a Baire space X with
the Kuratowski's partition".

References

- *[1] A.Emeryk, R.Frankiewicz, W.Kulpa* On functions having the Baire property, *Bull. Acad.Pol. Sci. 27, 6, (1979). 489-491.*
- *[2] A.Emeryk, R.Frankiewicz, W.Kulpa* Remarks on Kuratowski's Theorem on meager sets, *Bull. Acad.Pol. Sci. 27, 6, (1979). 493-498.*
- *[3] R.Frankiewicz, K.Kunen* Solution of Kuratowski's problem on functions having the Baire property, I, *Fund. Math. 127, (1987). 171-180.*
- *[4] A. Kechris* Classical descriptive set theory, *Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.*
- *[5] S. Plewik* On completely Ramsey sets, *Fund. Math. 127 (1986), 127–132.*
- *[6] S. Todorcevic* Topics in Topology, *Lecture Notes in Math. vol. 1652, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1997)*

Ryszard Frankiewicz
Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences,
Śniadeckich 8, 00-950 Warszawa, Poland
e-mail: rf@impan.pl

Sławomir Szczepaniak
Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences,
Śniadeckich 8, 00-950 Warszawa, Poland
e-mail: szczepaniak@impan.pan.wroc.pl